

In the Claims:

Claims 3, 4 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enabling requirement. For the above and below stated reasons in conjunction with the amendment to Claims 3, 4, and 8, the Applicant respectfully asserts that the Examiner's rejection concerning Claims 3, 4, and 8 has been traversed and the Claims are now in a condition for immediate allowance.

Claims 1-11 and 17 were rejected by the Examiner pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Wiedrich et al. For the following reasons, the Applicant respectfully asserts that this 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection has been traversed by this preliminary amendment and by argument herein.

With respect to Claim 1, the Examiner has asserted that Wiedrich et al discloses a similar method for dechlorinating a fluid. The applicant argues that Wiedrich et al does not disclose a bypass integrated device in its totality. The Wiedrich et al device provides for an unbalanced rate of dissolving in that the fluid must rise into the chamber. The flow is not through the dechlorination agent, but instead rises through perforations to come into contact with the dechlorination agent. This means that dissolving rate is not increased by mixing and by the turbulence of a flow through a dechlorinating agent as with the Applicant's device. To better control the rate of dissolving and cause the fluid to be treated to come in more contact with the dechlorination agent, an operator must also control the vacuum relief valve. Nonetheless, this does not guarantee a flow through the dechlorination agent or the turbulence to perform the dissolving of dechlorination agent required by high flow-rate applications. Additionally, in the Applicant's device, the flow of liquid flows through the dechlorination agent by differential pressure and does not require a control of level of fluid in the

device. Applicant respectfully asserts that independent Claim 5, is not disclosed by Wiedrich et al.

As to dependent Claim 2, it is dependent on independent Claim 1. Therefore, if the above transverse the examiner's rejection, regarding Claim 1, then dependent Claim 2 would also be in a condition of allowance.

Regarding dependent Claim 3, it also is dependent on independent Claim 1. Therefore, if the above transverse the examiner's rejection, regarding Claim 1, then dependent Claim 3 would also be in a condition of allowance.

As to dependent Claim 4, it is dependent on dependent Claim 3, which is dependent upon independent Claim 1. Therefore, if the above transverse the examiner's rejection, regarding Claim 1, and subsequently dependent Claim 3, then dependent Claim 4 would also be in a condition of allowance.

Regarding Claim 5, the Examiner has asserted that Wiedrich et al discloses a device for dechlorinating fluid. Applicant asserts that the value of the present invention is with the ease and portability provided by the flow tubes being an actual part of the present invention..

Applicant respectfully asserts that independent Claim 5, is not disclosed by Wiedrich et al. The present invention comprises a flow tube as part of the invention, which Wiedrich does not. This is an important feature of the present invention that provides the present invention with its portable and efficient nature, that is, it can be directly connected to a system with ease.

The reservoir in the present invention is part of a complete system for delivering a dechlorination agent. The complete system contains a flow tube that easily connected to a source of water, a bypass system for a determined amount fluid flow to be directed through a dechlorination agent reservoir, and a dechlorination reservoir. The totality of these components, the synergy of the

combination of the components and the efficiency of the connection to the source of the fluid flow provide the present invention its uniqueness.

The Wiedrich et al device does not disclose the ease of connection to a source of fluid flow, not does it disclose the synergistic effect of the combination of the components with the added unique benefit of the ease of connection to a fluid flow source. Even if the Wiedrich et al device were piped in a way similar to the present invention, it would still be lacking the ease of connection that the present invention is designed for to make it portable and efficient. That is, the present invention can be readily carried to a remote site, quickly hooked into a piping or hose system, ready for use. The Wiedrich et al device does not contain these limitations.

Applicant respectfully asserts that dependent Claim 6, is not disclosed by Wiedrich et al for the same reasons as stated above regarding independent Claim 5. It is the totality of the components, the synergistic effect of the combination of the components, and the efficiency of the connection to the source of the fluid flow provide uniqueness to the present invention. Piping in a control valve in conjunction with the Wiedrich et al device along with the disclosure in the Wiedrich et al device does not conjure the uniqueness of the present invention.

Applicant respectfully asserts that dependent Claim 7, is not disclosed by Wiedrich et al for the same reasons as stated above regarding independent Claim 5. Again, it is the totality of the components, the synergistic effect of the combination of the components, and the efficiency of the connection to the source of the fluid flow provide uniqueness to the present invention. The inclusion of an agent mixing chamber as part of the dechlorination agent reservoir does not conjure the uniqueness of the present invention.

Applicant respectfully asserts that dependent Claim 8, is not disclosed by Wiedrich et al for

the same reasons as stated above regarding independent Claim 5 and dependent Claim 7.

Applicant respectfully asserts that dependent Claim 9, is not disclosed by Wiedrich et al for the same reasons as stated above regarding independent Claim 5 and dependent Claim 7.

Applicant respectfully asserts that dependent Claim 10 is not disclosed by Wiedrich et al for the same reasons as stated above regarding independent Claim 5 and dependent Claim 6.

Applicant respectfully asserts that independent Claim 11, is not disclosed by Wiedrich et al for the same reasons as stated above regarding independent Claim 5.

Applicant respectfully asserts that independent Claim 17, is not disclosed by Wiedrich et al for the same reasons as stated above regarding independent Claim 5 and dependent Claim 11.

Claims 12, 13 and 19 were rejected by the Examiner pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiedrich et al in view of Heany. For the following reasons, the Applicant respectfully asserts that this rejection has been traversed by this preliminary amendment and by argument herein.

With respect to claims 12 and 13, the examiner has asserted that the prior art would work the same regardless if flow was caused by gravity or a pump. While that assertion may be true, it does not address the need for a pump to create a more time efficient dechlorination device or a device more efficient at dissolving a dechlorination agent. With the differences between the devices, and the suggested combination of the devices diminish the design efficiency with each.

Hence the Applicant re-asserts his discussion from the previous amendment that the combination of Wiedrich et al in view of Healy would not apply with regard to the present invention.

With respect to Claim 19, applicant relies on the discussion contained herein regarding Claim 5 and Claims 12 and 13.

Applicant respectfully states that the cited prior art, alone or in combination, does not anticipate or make obvious applicant's claimed invention.

Claims 14, 15, 16, and 18 were rejected by the Examiner pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiedrich et al in view of King. Applicant cancels claims 14, 15, 16, and 18.